IC ALL ROSENIANS (INCLUSION COUNCIL FOR ALL ROSENIANS): ASSESSING THE LEVEL OF INCLUSIVITY IN SANTA ROSA CITY AS BASIS FOR AN INTER-AGENCY INCLUSION COUNCIL

[1*]Manuela S. Tolentino, [1]Ceso V &
[1]Paulo B. Mangubos

*manuela.tolentino002@deped.gov.ph, paulo.mangubos001@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

Several societal goals, such as achieving universal education, expanding gender equality, reducing child mortality, and improving maternal health, depend on inclusion in the society. In this regard, the establishment of an Inclusion Council is one of the objectives stressed in the Executive Legislative Agenda (ELA) of the City of Santa Rosa, which focuses on Inclusive Education. Republic Act No. 11650, An Act Establishing a Policy of Inclusion and Services for Learners with Disabilities (LWDs) in Support of Inclusive Education Act, served as its foundation. This study assessed the level of inclusivity in the different agencies and sectors in the Local Government of Santa Rosa City. In terms of the level of implementation of inclusivity in the identified agencies and sectors - Manpower Development Office, City Youth Development Office, City Culture and Arts Office, City Scholarship Office, City Sports Development Office, and DepEd Santa Rosa City; it was proven that the respondents firmly support the implementation of inclusion in their respective agencies with regard to fostering an inclusive workplace, specifically in creating inclusive environment. With regard to producing inclusive policies, the respondents firmly concur that their respective agencies have rules on inclusion in the workplace. While for evolving inclusive practices, the respondents continue to actively support the development of inclusive practices in their offices or agencies. As a result of this study, it is concluded that Santa Rosa City's implementation of inclusivity is at a level where the personnel are aware of the concepts of inclusion among their agencies and offices. As recommended, the researchers proved the importance of an inclusion council that will enjoin all related agencies and sectors in the Local Government of Santa Rosa City. This study ensured the inclusivity among all the Rosenian with special needs to secure a future ahead of them by giving them equitable opportunities through an institutionalized Inclusion Council. Thus, it has been made possible and proven effective by assessing the level of inclusivity in the entire city among the different local government agencies and sectors that are expected to work altogether in an Inclusion Council for a more inclusive community.

Keywords: Inclusion Council, Inclusive Community, Special Education

INTRODUCTION

Inclusion in the community is crucial for attaining several societal objectives, including obtaining universal education, advancing gender equality, lowering child mortality, and enhancing maternal health. Certain groups of the population will continue to be excluded from the advancements made so far if people don't pay more attention to the inclusion issue. The ongoing social endeavor to advance inclusion can significantly speed up the process of building an inclusive society or community. This can be directly attributed to the inclusion of learners with disabilities who need to be developed through basic education.

In this connection, one of the goals being emphasized in the Executive Legislative Agenda (ELA) in the City of Santa Rosa which focuses in Inclusive Education is the creation of an Inclusion Council. It aims to organize a council composed of Education sector and other related agencies that will ensure inclusivity for the welfare of the Rosenians, more specifically the learners and youth. This aim is intensified with the sectoral vision – "by the year 2025, the City of Santa Rosa will be the primary city in CALABARZON with a highly organized and interrelated Inclusion Council that responds to challenges and opportunities through equitable, quality, accessible, and relevant education services programs through professional, innovative, and pro-active, governance which is resilient amid adversities."

This was anchored in the Republic Act No. 11650, An Act Instituting a Policy of Inclusion and Services for Learners with Disabilities (LWDs) in Support of Inclusive Education Act, which covers the establishing of inclusive learning resource centers of learners with disabilities in all school districts, municipalities and cities, providing for standards, appropriating funds therefor, and for other purposes. As mentioned, it is the policy of the State to protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels and shall take appropriate steps to make such education accessible to all. The whole-of-community approach shall be adopted for the inclusion of learners, wherein the community shall facilitate collaborative action in and by the school community, the academe, and other stakeholders, public and private, to foster the involvement and participation of every sector, especially the organization of persons with disabilities, the learners with disabilities, and their parents, guardians, and other members of their families.

It was imperative in the said Act that the State shall likewise recognize the vital role of LWDs in society as an integral part of the national development strategies. It shall accordingly guarantee their social protection, and facilitate their active participation and inclusion in public, civic, and State affairs. Section 6 highlights the Establishment of Inclusive Learning Resource Center of Learners with Disabilities (ILRC). The Department of Education, in collaboration with local government units (LGUs), shall initially establish and maintain at least one (1) ILRC in all cities and municipalities: Provided, that in cities and municipalities requiring the establishment of such ILRCs shall be established based on the multi-year roadmap, or as resources may allow. All existing SPEC Centers shall be converted to and renamed as "Inclusive Learning Resource Center." The LGUs may establish satellite ILRCs in schools, the operations and maintenance of which shall be included in the School Improvement Plan (SIP) that lays down the school's specific interventions and solutions to corresponding identified priority improvement areas and aims to improve the three (3) key result areas in basic education: access, quality, and governance.

As to the objective of this research, the researchers delved into the importance of an inclusion council enjoins all related agencies and sectors in the Local Government of Santa Rosa City. This ensures the inclusivity among all the Rosenian learners with special education needs

to secure a future ahead of them by giving them equitable opportunities through an institutionalized Inclusion Council.

List of Tables

LITERATURE REVIEW

Learners with Disability (LWDs) or Learners with Special Education Needs (LSENs)

In the community, disability moves the focus of attention from the individual to the obstacles the person encounters in their place of employment, or place of education. The identification and removal of barriers would thus be necessary in order to create an inclusive educational system. According to Neilson (2019), attitudes are one of the main obstacles that persons with impairments must overcome. The attitudes and beliefs in our school communities would then need to be examined in order to create an inclusive educational system. It would be necessary to create classroom environments where meaningful engagement is not restricted. This effort addresses the "how" of establishing inclusive schools and goes beyond resource distribution.

Ballard (2018) argues for a shift in culture and a new way of thinking when it comes to perceptions of disability and education in schools. Because people with disabilities must battle for rights that other community members take for granted, such as attending their local school and having access to enough resources to make their participation meaningful, disability is viewed as an oppression issue. Because it includes determining who is "special" and who is "normal," special education is political. According to Bauman (2019), "special" kids should go to a different school. Special education theory and practice are incompatible with the true inclusion of impaired students in the general education curriculum. When children are labeled as "special," it means that they are different from other kids and distinctive in ways that aren't respected in today's mainstream schools and culture. The inclusion of disabled children, who are now undervalued, requires a cultural shift in perceptions of disability, schools, and teaching (Ballard, 2018, p. 318).

Oliver (2018) also notes that although there have always been disabled people in all communities, the kinds of barriers they have had to overcome have changed over time. In other words, the severity of their handicap depended on the society in which they lived. This argument implies that while physical disabilities appear to have a random distribution, disability, on the other hand, is brought on by social, economic, or political factors. In a similar vein, unequal resource distribution, economic policies and practices, and ideologies have the deliberate impact of spreading poverty and poor health standards throughout society rather than at random. In addition, Slee and Allan (2020) believe that rather than merely changing our current behaviors and ways of thinking, people must first "deconstruct" them. In order for inclusion to thrive, school cultures must be restructured. Also, inclusion must be kept separate from the current regular education system. This is considered as a paradigm shift away from Special Education thinking. According to them, current "so-called inclusion policy has collapsed into a rudimentary model of distributive justice, leading to financially motivated education settlements, and as a result, inclusive schooling is reduced to pitched fights for allegedly scarce resources." Deconstruction generates original systems and solutions by "daring to imagine otherwise." It entails critically

analyzing the reasons behind why people act in certain ways, including the language being employed. The choice of language becomes particularly crucial if one phrase is simply substituting another yet underlying ideologies and procedures stay the same (Pearson, 2018; Slee, 2020).

Inclusive Community

This assures inclusion, equality of opportunity, and the capacity of all members of the society to establish an accepted set of social institutions that govern social interaction. An inclusive community transcends inequalities in color, gender, class, generation, and geography (Expert Group Meeting on Promoting Social Integration, Helsinki, July 2018). There are various perspectives on how a community that values social inclusion runs. Integration in all of its manifestations may only signify the presence of a dependable neighborhood where individuals can find a place to fit in (Taylor, 2018).

The essence of inclusion in the community and social integration, which is that differences among members of the community are allowed, is touched by this straightforward remark. Inclusivity in communities or integration does not imply uniformity among its members but rather a society that values interaction while allowing for variation. People's perspectives, needs, and concerns must be acknowledged if social integration and inclusion are to be achieved. Everyone in the community, regardless of background, must be able to voice their opinions and have a stake in the community in which they live. The inclusion in a community fosters and upholds stability and a readiness to accept change when it is required.

In an inclusive community, people not only have the right to education and the right to participate in various societal activities, but they also exercise those rights by getting an education and all things that matter for the lives of all types of people. The participation of the person in the processes by which society is controlled, ordered, and represented is what is most important in establishing an inclusion council. All members of the community must be capable of and motivated to engage in civic, social, economic, and political activities at both the local and national levels in order to establish and maintain inclusive societies. A community will best promote the values of inclusivity if the majority of its members, if not all, feel as though they are contributing, have access to their fundamental necessities and means of subsistence, and are given the chance to engage in processes that have an impact on their lives.

Additionally, universal access to public infrastructure and facilities is necessary to promote equitable participation (such as community centers, recreational facilities, public libraries, resource centers with internet facilities, well maintained public schools, clinics, water supplies and sanitations). These are the fundamental services that, whether partially or fully implemented, will establish the conditions for individuals to have a feeling of belonging by preventing them from going through the unpleasant consequences of not being able to afford them. They will all feel less burdened by their inequalities in socio-economic position as long as they have equal access to or benefit from these public facilities and services, hence reducing any potential feelings of exclusion or frustration.

Cheney and Muscott (2018) emphasize responsible inclusion for adolescents with complex social, emotional, and behavioral needs in inclusive schools. They highlight the challenges faced by these students, such as transfer of responsibility, teacher preparedness, service provider models, and curriculum differentiation. To address these challenges, they propose a seven-step

process, implemented in two phases, including creating a shared vision, reorganizing the school system, reorganizing staff duties, and fostering community collaboration.

The work of Cheney and Muscott (2018) helped shape the idea of inclusion as an effort involving the entire school and community, but it also revealed a lack of investigation into the more fundamental social justice principles behind inclusion. Their approach was mechanical and concentrated on academic procedures. When they questioned impaired kids and their parents to identify obstacles to their involvement in school, they helped refocus their counterparts. Although the physical environment's accessibility was frequently cited, the main impediment was identified as intentional and inadvertent attitudinal hurdles. Isolation, physical and emotional bullying were seen to be intentional attitudinal impediments. Unintentional attitudinal hurdles were attributed to a lack of systems or teachers' expertise, comprehension, or willingness. In the research focus groups, students were quite willing to suggest ways to facilitate their inclusion, particularly in the social sphere, such as raising instructors' and other students' understanding of disabilities and allowing them to participate actively in their education. Students with disabilities were requesting opportunities to exercise their agency and demonstrate their aptitude while deconstructing what is meant and recognized as difference, according to Higgins, MacArthur, and Kelly (2019).

Inclusion Council

It has been difficult to define inclusion, which is a strength. One can keep looking into the term's more profound implications and principles thanks to its open nature. It might be more beneficial to view inclusion as a continuum than a specific objective. Exploring the nature of inclusion broadens the common knowledge of what it might entail. As a form of mainstreaming or integration, inclusion first emerged (Munoz, 2018). It is now well acknowledged that merely "being in" is insufficient. Concerned with inclusion is the level of participation. A broader definition of inclusion has been adopted, focusing on any students or community members who encounter obstacles to full and meaningful involvement (Ballard, 2019).

It's not just a "special needs thing" anymore. It has been realized that inclusion genuinely involves everyone when trying to change our schools to embrace a specific sort of student. The possibility to design schools that cater to and embrace every member of the neighborhood is a big question. That is the difficulty that our schools are experiencing. It is not about achieving targets or goals established by the ministry; rather, it is about how schools can redesign their practices and principles to become inclusive.

A team of employees, including senior leaders or executives, works on behalf of the organization to launch and oversee the diversity and inclusion process. This team is known as an inclusion council. In order to achieve tight alignment with the organization's overall business strategy and to assist in institutionalizing human capital practices that support and expedite goals, the Council closely collaborates with senior management. The Inclusion Council supports communication on progress, provides governance and oversight for diversity efforts, and aids in creating strategic accountability for results. The most effective councils successfully synchronize its program with the organization's mission, initiatives, and goals.

Inclusion councils are crucial for managing inclusion programs, promoting diversity and inclusion initiatives, and promoting organizational transformation. They monitor, evaluate, and initiate reforms, linking inclusion initiatives to a comprehensive strategy. Some councils address

specific demographic groups, while others focus on diversity by considering organizational job, educational background, management style, geography, or demographic group.

Thus, national governments must determine their own inclusion goals and objectives based on the general framework created at the international level, considering their unique requirements and context. The broad inclusion council's aims or objectives must be linked to the specific vision that individuals have for their society—a hopeful picture of a society that is inclusive in the future. It is important to articulate this goal as specifically as possible to enable effective monitoring and analysis, perhaps with the use of a set of indicators. This means that there is coherence between goals set at the national and local levels. These goals and objectives subsequently filter down to the local and community levels. Although each community may have different goals, all communities should share the same overarching objectives or guiding principles.

Inclusion council aims should include principles such as shared future, rights, respect, social cohesiveness, equality, equity, social justice, faith in authorities, belonging, and interconnectedness. Research on inclusive schools in the US, UK, and Portugal reveals specific characteristics reflecting inclusive culture, including unwavering commitment, differences among students and staff, teaming, and staff willingness to maintain practicums. These systems reflect unique personalities and should be adapted to each institution's unique circumstances. There was a deliberate effort to create an inclusive culture, a supportive and collaborative environment intentionally created to foster an exploration of deeply held values and beliefs in the schools described by Kugelmass (2018), in contrast to the experiences found by Freire 2019), Freire and Cesar (2003), Paliokosta and Blandford (2010), and Freire and Blandford (2010). As these values were shared, the school sought alliances within the local communities or with neighboring schools, responding in a coordinated manner to sustain their inclusive cultures when the inclusive nature of the school was challenged (for example, through legislation to standardize instruction or assessment).

Therefore, in order to enable all individuals in a community to participate in social, economic, cultural, and political life on the basis of equality of rights, equity, and dignity, social integration is regarded as a dynamic and ethical process. Inclusion Council covers the process that communities engage in to promote societies that are stable, safe, and just. These are based on the promotion and protection of all human rights, as well as respect for and value of each individual's dignity, diversity, pluralism, tolerance, non-discrimination, non-violence, equality of opportunity, solidarity, security, and participation of all people, including disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and individuals.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed the descriptive research design, wherein the researchers had options as complete observer, an observer as a participant, a participant as an observer, or a full participant. It allowed the researcher to study and describe the distribution of one or more variables, without regard to any causal or other hypotheses.

A. Sampling

This study employed simple random sampling to identify the research respondents. Simple random sampling is the randomized selection of a small segment of individuals or members from a whole population. It provides each individual or member of a population with an equal and fair probability of being chosen. The simple random sampling method is one of the most convenient and simple sample selection techniques (Taylor, 2023).

The total number of respondents were taken from the Human Resource Management of Office of Santa Rosa City with a total of 311 employees. As per Slovin's Formula, 174 respondents were needed to answer the survey questionnaire. After identifying the required number of respondents, the researchers did convenience sampling by choosing the readily available employees present during the data gathering. The researchers employed the Google Survey Form to 200 employees. Thus, the responses from the first 174 respondents were taken for analysis and interpretation.

B. Data Collection

Data gathering and procedures were accomplished by conducting an online structured survey using Google forms to answer the research questions. The questionnaire was modified from the study of Tony Booth, et al., titled "Index for Inclusion: Developing Learning and Participation in Schools." A permission from the authors of the said study was secured for the purpose of identifying the necessary indicators and features of inclusivity in schools and offices.

In the Google form, respondents were given options from which to choose. After the analysis of quantitative data, the researchers did the interpretation about the significant results that both phases emphasize. Parameters were reviewed and outcomes were utilized.

The Likert Scale was used in the interpretation of data. The following interval and interpretations were used as to the assessment on the different indicators of the study:

Assigned Points	Numerical Ranges	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.25 - 4.00	Strongly Agree
3	2.5 - 3.24	Agree
2	1.75 - 2.49	Disagree
1	1 - 1.74	Strongly Disagree

C. Ethical Issues

The researcher followed the approach detailed by Creswell (2018), as cited in Batuctoc & Medrano (2021) and Marcelo & Juanillas (2021), for the systematic steps in maintaining ethical procedures of the study. These ethical procedures were observed through the research process to protect the rights of both researcher and participants regarding disclosure of personal information and experiences. In this regard, the researchers maintained highest quality of output by protecting and protecting the rights of the respondents/participants regarding disclosure of information, participation in and withdrawal from the conduct of study, and responding to the questions on their freewill.

Before the data gathering, the researchers disclosed all information regarding the participation in the study including the benefits, requirements, and needed data to maintain the integrity and solemnity of the research process. This is also a way for the researchers to gain the trust of the participants.

During the process, the researchers secured the respondents and participants' rights to self-determination, full disclosure, and withdraw from the process at any time specifically if they felt uncomfortable with the questions or with the situation in general.

RESULTS AND FINDING

This part includes a presentation and analysis of the study's findings based on the analysis of quantitative data. The presentation of the findings was done based on its arrangement in the statement of the problem.

1. **The identified agencies and sectors in Santa Rosa City that employ inclusivity in their workplace**

This study investigated on the following identified agencies:

- DepEd Santa Rosa City

Schools Division Office of the City of Santa Rosa, is a medium-sized division, strategically located at the heart of the City of Santa Rosa. It has 18 elementary schools, 2 Junior High Schools, 6 Integrated High Schools, 1 Stand Alone Senior High Schools and 24 ALS learning centers and 91 private schools that cater to a total of 83,046* learners. The Philippine Statistics Authority projected school-aged population based on the annual growth rate of 8.2% in 2019 from around 7.5% in 2015 (www.rappler.com). Thus, the Division of Santa Rosa City was able to accommodate 68.24% of the projected school-age population of 121,700 (City Planning and Development Office).

- Manpower Development Office

The City of Santa Rosa Manpower Development Office is a model in local governance effectively responding to the welfare of its people through innovative policies and programs, and integrated strategy anchored on.

- City Youth Development Office

Its main goals are to advance and uphold young people's democratic and social rights, to encourage their social and political engagement at all levels of community life, and to provide them with opportunities for personal and social growth through leisure pursuits, volunteer work, and informal and non-formal education.

- City Culture and Arts Office

Its principal goal is to promote culture and sports, working in coordination with both government and non-government organizations to assure their support and growth.

- City Scholarship Office

It is the top scholarship program in the nation with the goal of creating scholar-leaders who are grounded, competent, and change agents in their communities.

- City Sports Development Office

The office conducts sports clinics such as basketball, badminton, table tennis, arnis, among others; lending of sports equipment; referees training; provide financial assistance to barangays and sports association; monitoring the sports activities in the city.

Thus, the level of inclusivity in each of the said agencies/sectors were measured in indicators given in each variable below.

2. **The level of implementation of inclusivity in the identified agencies and sectors in Santa Rosa City in terms of:**

Table 1: Creating Inclusive Environment

Indicators	WM	Description
1. Is the agency/office welcoming to all, including those with impairments/disabilities?]	3.70	Strongly Agree
2. Is information about the agency/office accessible to all, irrespective of home language or impairment?]	3.70	Strongly Agree
3. Is there an agency/office brochure that responds to the full diversity of personnel and their backgrounds is part of office routine?]	3.55	Strongly Agree
4. Does the agency/office celebrate local cultures and communities in office signs, and displays?]	3.02	Agree
5. Do the personnel offer assistance to each other when it is needed?]	3.38	Strongly Agree
6. Do the personnel share rather than compete for friends?]	3.55	Strongly Agree
7. Do office displays celebrate collaborative work by personnel as well as individual achievements?]	3.40	Strongly Agree
8. Do the personnel report to a member of staff, when someone needs assistance?]	3.47	Strongly Agree
9. Do the personnel avoid racist, sexist, homophobic, disablist and other forms of discriminatory name-calling?]	3.40	Strongly Agree
10. Do the personnel appreciate the achievements of others whose starting points may be different from their own?]	3.43	Strongly Agree
11. Are all staff invited to staff meetings?]	3.51	Strongly Agree
12. Do all staff and personnel attend meetings?]	3.36	Strongly Agree
13. Do staff feel comfortable about discussing problems in their work?]	3.34	Strongly Agree
14. Do staff and personnel treat one another with respect?]	3.30	Strongly Agree
15. Do members of local communities share facilities with staff and such as the comfort rooms, hall and canteen?]	3.43	Strongly Agree
16. Is there a positive view of the agency/office within the local communities?]	3.38	Strongly Agree
17. Is diversity seen as a rich resource to support learning rather than as a problem?]	3.45	Strongly Agree
18. Is inclusion understood as a never-ending process of increasing participation rather than a state of being inside or outside of the agency/office?]	3.40	Strongly Agree

19. Is exclusion understood as a process that starts in the office which may end in separation from the community?]	3.43	Strongly Agree
20. Do all staff and personnel take responsibility for making the agency/school more inclusive?]	3.34	Strongly Agree
General Weighted Mean	**3.41**	**Strongly Agree**

WM: Weighted Mean, VI: Verbal Interpretation, 1 - 1.74 - Strongly Disagree; 1.75 - 2.49 – Disagree; 2.5 - 3.24 – Agree; 3.25-4.00 - Strongly Agree

The table shows that the respondents strongly agree in the inclusivity being implemented in their respective agencies in terms of creating inclusive environment. With the general weighted mean of 3.41, the respondents showed their strong belief on the enumerated indicators that proved its significance in their work environment. Among the said indicators, the agency/office which is welcoming to all, including those with impairments/disabilities got the highest weighted mean, which implies that they strongly agree on the implementation of inclusivity in their work station. Diversity, involvement, and belonging are valued in a workplace that is positive and inclusive. The idea of inclusion in the workplace will always remain prevalent. Employers must allow employees to be fully true versions of themselves. One has to feel included in order to develop genuineness. They believe that a welcoming environment, including those with impairments/disabilities, is crucial for fostering diversity, involvement, and belonging. Inclusivity remains prevalent, and employers must allow employees to be their true selves.

As mentioned in an article by National University (2020), the sense of belonging that inclusion fosters among coworkers can lead to increased productivity, more creative thinking, and better decision-making. When team members feel more connected, team performance increases. When everyone is pulling from the same side of the rope, the chances of success and growth skyrocket. Strong leadership is the first step in creating an inclusive workplace, and having a committed design team with specific knowledge and expertise in market-current workplace rules may pay off for everyone involved. Forbes claims that these teams perform better in terms of creativity, identifying and ending exclusion, and luring and keeping great personnel.

On the contrary, the indicator on the availability of brochure that responds to the full diversity of personnel and their backgrounds is part of office routine got the lowest weighted mean, which can be gleaned that the identified agencies need to provide more brochures about inclusivity in the office.

Table 2: Producing Inclusive Policies

Indicators	WM	Description
1. Are there opportunities for all staff and personnel to share their knowledge and expertise, so that this includes contributions from new staff?]	3.45	Strongly Agree
2. Do senior staff and personnel avoid making new staff feel outsiders, for example by the use of a 'we' or an 'us' which excludes them?]	3.34	Strongly Agree
3. Does the agency/office recognize the difficulties that new staff may have in settling into a new job in what may be a new locality?]	3.36	Strongly Agree
4. Does every staff and personnel have a mentor who is genuinely interested in helping him or her to settle into the office?]	3.26	Strongly Agree
5. Are new staff and personnel provided with the basic information they need about the agency/office?]	3.40	Strongly Agree
6. Does the agency/office have an induction program for the staff and personnel?]	3.45	Strongly Agree

7. Does the induction program work well for the staff and personnel and their families whether they join at the start of the year or some other time?]	3.43	Strongly Agree
8. Does the induction program consider staff and personnel differences in office works?]	3.36	Strongly Agree
9. Are new staff and personnel asked about what additional information they need, and is it provided?]	3.34	Strongly Agree
10. Are new staff and personnel paired with more experienced personnel when they first enter the office?]	3.34	Strongly Agree
11. Is the agency/school concerned with the accessibility of all aspects of the office building and grounds, function halls, corridors, toilets, gardens, canteen and displays?]	3.40	Strongly Agree
12. Does the agency/office pay attention to the requirement of the 1995 Disability Discrimination Act to make progress each year on the accessibility of the office?]	3.32	Strongly Agree
13. Is accessibility seen as about including disabled staff and personnel, and other members of the community?]	3.36	Strongly Agree
14. Is information available for staff and personnel on the national and local government system as well as about the community?]	3.30	Strongly Agree
15. Is there support for the staff and personnel who have difficulty familiarizing the building layout, particularly when they first join the agency/office?]	3.36	Strongly Agree
16. Are the new staff and personnel clear about who to see if they experience difficulties?]	3.40	Strongly Agree
17. Is there an overall support policy which is clear to all within the agency/office as well as to those who support learning from outside the office?]	3.28	Strongly Agree
18. Does the support given to individuals aim to increase their independence from it?]	3.34	Strongly Agree
19. Are support policies guided by what is best for the staff and personnel rather than the maintenance of professional territories?]	3.32	Strongly Agree
20. Do staff development activities support staff and personnel in working effectively together in the office?]	3.43	Strongly Agree
General Weighted Mean	**3.36**	**Strongly Agree**

WM: Weighted Mean, VI: Verbal Interpretation, 1 - 1.74 - Strongly Disagree; 1.75 - 2.49 – Disagree; 2.5 - 3.24 – Agree; 3.25-4.00 - Strongly Agree

As it can be gleaned from the table, the respondents strongly agree that their respective agencies have policies on the inclusivity in their workplace. The general weighted mean of 3.36 revealed that almost all the indicators have been met to measure the extent of the implementation of inclusivity in the offices and agencies in Santa Rosa City. Among the given indicators, the question if the agency/office has an induction program for the staff and personnel has the highest weighted mean. This means that they all strongly agreed on the conduct of induction programs for new employees that pertains to inclusion in their offices. Improving inclusion in the workplace is a crucial component of effective people management. To gain from inclusion, work settings and cultures must be developed where each person may feel safe, a sense of belonging, and the freedom to realize their full potential.

Further, as it was discussed in a research, one of the biggest obstacles to implementing inclusive education (IE) is that it requires equal education for all students, including those with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), as outlined by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 1994, 2018). According to studies on inclusion policies and their implementation, this contentious subject poses moral and academic

conundrums (Acedo, Ferrer, and Pamies, 2019). According to a 2019 report by the Inclusive International Organization, SEND students are still being kept out of the classroom. However, thorough research is missing, and in order to oversee equal education programs, it is necessary to look at implementation challenges as well as define success indicators.

Though most of the respondents strongly agreed in indicator 4, if every staff and personnel have a mentor who is genuinely interested in helping him or her to settle into the office, it got the lowest weighted mean of 3.26, which means that the agencies and offices must consider giving emphasis on mentorship regarding inclusion in the workplace. According to Acedo et al. (2019), implementing inclusion policies necessitates realizing that IE is a continuous process that needs daily upkeep and entails locating and eliminating barriers as well as building a strong foundation of inclusive organization and pedagogy. According to Shani (2018), who reviewed the research in the area, there are four main factors that affect inclusion implementation: a) policy, legislation, and coordination between them and the actual needs in the field; b) the caliber of support provided to students with SEND; c) the caliber of training provided to staff members who work with students with SEND; and d) the nature of the impairment and educational capacities.

Table 3: Evolving Inclusive Practices

Indicators	WM	Description
1. Does the agency/office involve work to be done by individuals, pairs, groups and the whole organization?]	3.45	Strongly Agree
2. Is there a variety of activities, including discussion, practical tasks and information technology?]	3.32	Strongly Agree
3. Are the staff and personnel encouraged to explore views which are different from their own?]	3.28	Strongly Agree
4. Are opportunities provided for the staff and personnel to work with others who are different from themselves in terms of background, ethnicity, impairment and gender?]	3.43	Strongly Agree
5. Do staff show that they respect and value alternative views when there are discussions and meetings?]	3.40	Strongly Agree
6. Are issues of classism, sexism, racism, disablism, homophobia and religious prejudice discussed?]	3.30	Strongly Agree
7. Are the staff and personnel taught about the multi-cultural influences on inclusivity in the community?]	3.34	Strongly Agree
8. Is there an open and equitable distribution of resources in the agency/school?]	3.36	Strongly Agree
9. Is it clear how the resources are assigned to support the staff and personnel of different ages and attainments?]	3.40	Strongly Agree
10. Are staff aware of the resources delegated to the office to support the staff and personnel categorized as 'having special educational needs'?]	3.40	Strongly Agree
11. Are resources, delegated to meet 'special educational needs', used to increase the capacity of the agency/office to respond to diversity?]	3.34	Strongly Agree
12. Are support resources directed at preventing barriers to learning and participation and minimizing individual categorization?]	3.30	Strongly Agree
13. Do staff and personnel review the use of delegated resources regularly so that they can be used flexibly to respond to the changing needs of all the personnel?]	3.26	Strongly Agree
14. Is there monitoring of the achievements of different groups of the staff and personnel, so that particular difficulties can be detected and addressed?]	3.34	Strongly Agree
15. Does the approach to discipline encourage self-discipline in agency/office?]	3.34	Strongly Agree

16. Do staff support share their concerns and pool their knowledge and skills in overcoming disruption?]	3.34	Strongly Agree
17. Are there clear procedures, understood by the staff and personnel and teachers for responding to extremes of challenging behavior?]	3.26	Strongly Agree
18. Does the head of agency/office welcomes comments from subordinates and colleagues?]	3.40	Strongly Agree
19. Does the head of agency/office engages with others in joint problem solving?]	3.40	Strongly Agree
20. Do staff working in partnership, share responsibility for ensuring that all the staff and personnel participate?]	3.47	Strongly Agree
General Weighted Mean	**3.36**	**Strongly Agree**

WM: Weighted Mean, VI: Verbal Interpretation, 1 - 1.74 - Strongly Disagree; 1.75 - 2.49 – Disagree; 2.5 - 3.24 – Agree; 3.25-4.00 - Strongly Agree

Table no. 3 shows the responses of the respondents in the indicators which they still strongly agree on the evolving inclusive practices in their agencies/offices. The general weighted mean of 3.36 affirms that the inclusivity in their workstation is evident. Most of their responses were under strongly agree, which signify that inclusion has been supported and continuously evolving for all the personnel and staff members. The highest indicator was about the agency/office which involves work to be done by individuals, pairs, groups and the whole organization. Its weighted mean of 3.45 strongly suggests that they can experience and observe it within and among the offices. This is true just like what has been proven in a research, which states that what is needed to help deepen an understanding of inclusion is the creation of space within the school in which deeply held values and beliefs can be examined and scrutinised (Ainscow, 2018). Sustainability is a central success factor in creating inclusive school cultures. The model of professional learning, or how inclusive values and practices will be developed, must be designed so that the learning that takes place over a period of time is reinforced through self-reflection. Learning that involves developing theoretical knowledge as well as the skills to enquire into practice has been demonstrated as being essential to sustaining that learning (Timperley, Wilson, Barrar & Fung, 2019).

However, indicator 13 has the lowest weighted mean, 3.26, which is about staff and personnel review the use of delegated resources regularly so that they can be used flexibly to respond to the changing needs of all the personnel. It is crucial that any area formed within the offices to examine this transition process be constructively filled with an assessment of any deficiency or deviant language that may have shaped perspectives about student ability, handicap, or potential. This was described as an educational discourse by Skidmore in 2002. A "discourse of deviance" or a "discourse of inclusion" is a term used by teachers to explain how they theorize learning (and the educability of their students). The findings of Paliokosta and Blandford's (2020) investigation of three secondary schools in the United Kingdom corroborated those of Freire and César's (2018) study. Although legislation and policy required schools to implement inclusive practices, the authors discovered that many teachers lacked the conceptual background to distinguish between inclusion and integration. According to Paliokosta and Blandford's study (2020), "inclusion can work by removing the diagnostic paradigm associated with special educational needs and by creating a framework for teachers' lifelong learning focusing on a social justice oriented pedagogy that will empower teachers conceptually and practically."

3.   Provisions and improvements for the proposed Inclusion Council can be recommended from this study

Based on the responses of the respondents, it has been proven that the identified agencies in Santa Rosa City have been implementing inclusion or inclusivity. Thus, it shall be further developed and enhanced by focusing on the indicators with low weighted mean. With this, an Inclusion Council for All Rosenian citizens is being conceptualized in order to make further advancements in the inclusive community among and across agencies and offices. This Inclusion Council shall be composed of Education sector and other related agencies that will ensure inclusivity for the welfare of the Rosenian citizens in all the agencies and offices in Santa Rosa.

DISCUSSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

For the agencies and sectors in Santa Rosa City employ inclusivity in their workplace, the following were identified: Manpower Development Office, City Youth Development Office, City Culture and Arts Office, City Scholarship Office, City Sports Development Office, and DepEd Santa Rosa City. They are all contributory to the education sector in the entire city, wherein inclusion is being implemented.

With regard to the level of implementation of inclusivity in the identified agencies and sectors in Santa Rosa City in terms of creating inclusive environment, the respondents firmly support the implementation of inclusion in their respective agencies with regard to fostering an inclusive workplace. The respondents demonstrated their strong belief in the enumerated indicators that demonstrated its significance in their work environment with a general weighted mean of 3.41. When it comes to producing inclusive policies, the respondents firmly concur that their respective agencies have rules on inclusion in the workplace, as can be seen from the table. The overall weighted mean of 3.36 showed that practically all the metrics to gauge the degree of inclusion implementation in Santa Rosa City offices and agencies have been reached. The question of whether the agency/office provides an induction program for the employees and personnel has the highest weighted mean among the available metrics. While for evolving inclusive practices, the respondents continue to actively support the development of inclusive practices in their offices or agencies. The overall weighted mean of 3.36 confirms that their workstation's inclusivity is obvious. The majority of their comments fell under the strongly agree category, indicating that all staff and workers have supported and actively pursued inclusion.

The listed agencies in Santa Rosa City have been adopting inclusion or inclusivity, as shown by the respondents' responses. As a result, it will be improved and developed further by concentrating on the indicators with low weighted means. In order to further develop the inclusive community within and between agencies and offices, an inclusion council for all Rosenian residents is being conceptualized.

Conclusions

Based on the results and findings, it is concluded that Santa Rosa City's implementation of inclusivity is at a level where the personnel are aware of the concepts of inclusion among their agencies and offices. They strongly agreed that they have observed the set indicators and identified its level by assessing what they have experienced in their respective workplaces. Among all the agencies and offices, it has been evident that inclusion is being implemented. Thus,

it can be further enhanced and improved through an Inclusion Council for All Rosenians. As these values were shared, the city sought alliances within the local communities, responding in a coordinated manner to sustain their inclusive cultures when the inclusive nature of the city was challenged (for example, through legislation to standardize instruction or assessment). It's important to emphasize that they were prepared to defend it because they actively promoted an inclusive society. Instead of quitting up or labeling inclusion as "too hard," difficulty strengthened networks within and outside the community.

Recommendations

As recommended, based on the results of this study, the researchers delved into the level of implementation of inclusion in the identified agencies, which shall be strengthened and institutionalized through the Inclusion Council. It will enjoin all other related agencies and sectors in the Local Government of Santa Rosa City with implementing policies in inclusivity in its respective offices. This will firmly establish the inclusivity for all the Rosenians with special needs to secure a future ahead of them by giving them equitable opportunities. As it has been conceptualized, the institutionalized Inclusion Council shall be called "*IC all Rosenians: Inclusion Council for All Rosenian Citizens.*" Thus, the following provisions will be applied from RA 11650, AN ACT INSTITUTING A POLICY OF INCLUSION AND SERVICES FOR LEARNERS WITH DISABILITIES IN SUPPORT OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION, ESTABLISHING INCLUSIVE LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS OF LEARNERS WITH DISABILITIES IN ALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, MUNICIPALITIES AND CITIES, PROVIDING FOR STANDARDS, APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, as this Inclusion Council is anchored further supports its establishment, which states in that:

e. To create significant and positive changes in community orientation towards disability to ensure that learners with disabilities are understood, appreciated, and respected for their differences by the members of their communities and by society in general

h. To institutionalize the development, implementation, and review of the Individualized Education Plan for the quality education of learners with disabilities

i. To provide parents or guardians of learners with disabilities with information and opportunities to actively participate in the determination of educational placement options and programs to enable them to make informed choices and decisions

j. To enable and empower all teachers, including those with disabilities, parents, guardians, and family members by training and equipping them with capabilities for the detection, referral or introduction of interventions with regard to disorders, disabilities, and abilities of the learners

m. To establish an effective consultative mechanism that will actively involve learners with disabilities, when appropriate, and their representative organizations in resolving issues relating to it.

Pursuant to this, IC all Rosenians shall serve as the main flagbearer of the City of Santa Rosa to be the first city municipality in Region IV - A CALABARZON with a highly organized and interrelated Inclusion Council that responds to challenges and opportunities through equitable, quality, accessible, and relevant education services programs through professional, innovative, and pro-active, governance which is resilient amid adversities

REFERENCES

Ballard, K. (1999). Inclusive education: International voices on disability and justice. London: Falmer.

Ballard, K. (2004). Children and disability: Special or included? Waikato Journal of Education, 10, 315-326.

Bauman, Z. (2007). Society Enables and Disables. Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research, 9(1), 58-60. doi: 10.1080/15017410500530068

Cheney, D., & Muscott, H. (1996). Preventing school failure for students with emotional and behavioral disabilities through responsible inclusion. Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 40(3), 109-116. doi: 10.1080/1045988x.1996.9944663

Munoz, V. (2007). The right to education of persons with disabilities: Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education: United Nations Human Rights Council, 4th Session, Item 2 of the agenda.

Republic Act No. 11650. (n.d.). The Lawphil Project - Arellano Law Foundation, Inc. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2022/ra_11650_2022.html

Slee, R. (2011). The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education. London: Routledge.

Slee, R., & Allan, J. (2001). Excluding the included: A reconsideration of inclusive education. International Studies in Sociology of Education, 11(2), 173-192. doi: 10.1080/09620210100200073